



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,180	05/10/2000	Helmut Mothes	M0-6241/HR-2	7595
7590 04/06/2004				
STEPHAN A. PENDORF PENDORF & CUTLIFF 5111 MEMORIAL HIGHWAY TAMPA, FL 33634-7356		EXAMINER COLE, MONIQUE T		
		ART UNIT 1743		
		PAPER NUMBER		

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AC

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/787,180	MOTHES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Monique T. Cole	1743	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. A new action on the merits follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 20-24 & 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 4,568,560 to Schobel (herein referred to as "Schobel").

Schobel teaches a controlled release encapsulated fragrance with a coating composition that comprises hydrophilic solid particles that comprise ethyl cellulose encasing a fragrance (abstract). Although not specified by Schobel, it is the Examiner's position that the hydrophilic solid particles are capable of having reversible gel formation as temperature increases because the encapsulated particles of Schobel comprise the same ingredients as the encapsulate claimed by Applicant. When the encapsulated particles are added to water, fragrance is released in a time-related manner (col. 7, lines 25-31). Ethyl cellulose is added in an amount of up to 30% of the composition (claim 3). The ethyl cellulose may be coated on the capsules via fluidized bed apparatus (col. 3, lines 3-6). Example II is directed to using the encapsulated fragrances in a

Art Unit: 1743

detergent. Col. 7, lines 38-61 teaches using the encapsulated fragrance in a chewing gum.

Methyl cellulose and hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose are also taught as encapsulating materials (col. 4, lines 41-46 & Example I).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 25-42 & 44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schobel.

Schobel teaches a controlled release encapsulated fragrance with a coating composition that comprises hydrophilic solid particles that comprise ethyl cellulose encasing a fragrance (abstract). Although not specified by Schobel, it is the Examiner's position that the hydrophilic solid particles are capable of having reversible gel formation as temperature increases because the encapsulated particles of Schobel comprise the same ingredients as the encapsulate claimed by

Applicant. When the encapsulated particles are added to water, fragrance is released in a time-related manner (col. 7, lines 25-31). Ethyl cellulose is added in an amount of up to 30% of the composition (claim 3). The ethyl cellulose may be coated on the capsules via fluidized bed apparatus (col. 3, lines 3-6). Example II is directed to using the encapsulated fragrances in a detergent. Col. 7, lines 38-61 teaches using the encapsulated fragrance in a chewing gum. Methyl cellulose and hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose are also taught as encapsulating materials (col. 4, lines 41-46 & Example I).

Schobel differs from the instantly claimed invention in that it does not expressly detail whether the fragrance encapsulates are produced by fluidized bed spray granulation. However, Schobel does teach that the spray dried flavors and fragrances are prepared by dissolving in water a solid carrier for the flavor or fragrance oil. The oil is then added to the water solution of carrier with high shear mixing in order to disperse the oil. The dispersion of the oil in carrier solution is then spray dried. The spray dried flavor are of a fine particle size. The coating composition in the carrier vehicle is sprayed into the inlet stream of a fluidized bed in which the flavoring agent or fragrance particles are fluidized. The coating can be applied from an emulsion. Spray dried flavors and fragrances are generally available as fine powders which are granulated to provide particles in the 20-50 mesh range. The disclosed method of granulation utilizes a rotary mixer wherein a solution is added into the powder mix and blended until a uniformly wet granulation develops. The granulated material is then wet screened through a 20 mesh screen, oven dried and re-seived. See col. 2, lines 25-30, 45-60; col. 3, lines 5-7; col. 4, lines 30-51. It is the Examiner's position that this disclosure is a sufficient teaching such that it would have

Art Unit: 1743

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to perform the process of making a encapsulated aroma and/or perfume such as instantly claimed.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With regard to claims 20-23, these claims are product-by-process claims, which are defined by the product, not the process, absent evidence of a different process being derived. See MPEP 2113.

With regard to claim 24, Applicant has asserted that the claim includes closed transitional language (i.e., "consisting of"). However, this is an incorrect assertion as the claim in line 2 clearly includes the open language "comprising". Thus, Applicant's remarks concerning closed transition language are not being considered.

With regard to claim 44, Applicant has stated that the claim has been amended to exclude ethyl cellulose from the grouping of modified celluloses. However, this does not appear to have been done, as ethyl cellulose is still recited in the claim.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monique T. Cole whose telephone number is 571-272-1255.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1743

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Monique T. Cole
Examiner
Art Unit 1743

MC